

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/642,200	08/18/2003	Toru Shimosato	02410276US	1111	
7055 75	590 08/25/2005		EXAMINER		
	M & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C	•	GATES, ERIC ANDREW		
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE . RESTON, VA 20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			3722		

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	I A		<i>XV</i>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	U
	10/642,200	SHIMOSATO ET A	AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eric A. Gates	3722	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence ad	dress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REATHER MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a second of the second for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	ireply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely NTHS from the mailing date of this considered timely NBANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	·	•	merits is
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7 and 8 is/5	are withdrawn from conside		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 December 2003</u> is	s/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[objected to by the Exam	iner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	•		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents of ☐ Certified copies.	ents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	riority documents have been	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Stage
application from the International Bure		t received	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a I	ist of the certified copies no	t received.	
ttachment(s)			
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· —	Summary (PTO-413)	
) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTC)-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/18/03</u> .	6) Other:	•	•

Application/Control Number: 10/642,200

Art Unit: 3722

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claims 3, 6, and 9, in the reply filed on August 4, 2005, is acknowledged.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3722

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 4. under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). AAPA discloses in the instant specification that it is well known in the art to have an automotive knuckle comprising an inner surface and a bottom portion, wherein a fitting hole is fitted with a wheel bearing, a through hole is opened to the inner surface of the fitting hole, and an open end portion of the through hole is deburred. AAPA is silent as to whether a contour of the open-end portion is shaped nearly like an ellipsoid having a major axis and a minor axis, and no advantage is provided for having the contour of the open-end portion shaped this way, as opposed to the open end portion having a circular chamfer as would be expected by deburring through the through hole. The claimed phrase "by inserting a cutting tool... while simultaneously making the leading end portion of the through hole" is being treated as a product by process limitation; that is, that the open-end portion of the through hole is deburred as claimed. As set forth in MPEP 2113, product by process claims are NOT limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only to the structure implied by the steps. Once a product appearing to be substantially the same or similar is found, a 35 U.S.C. 102/103 rejection may be made and the burden is shifted to applicant to show an unobvious difference. See MPEP 2113. Thus, even though AAPA discloses a different method for deburring the open end portion of the through hole, it appears that the product disclosed in AAPA

Art Unit: 3722

would be the same or similar as that claimed; especially since both applicant's claimed product and the AAPA product are of the same design. In the alternative, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have deburred the open end portion of the through hole through the fitting hole in order to avoid the difficulties caused by deburring through the through hole, because this would have simply involved the selection of a tool designed to deburr at an angle.

5. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Shikata. Claims 6 and 9 are also being treated as product by process limitations. In the alternative, the modified automotive knuckle of AAPA discloses the invention substantially as claimed, except AAPA does not disclose a deburring cutting angle of 45 degrees, or the cutting tool to be a ball end mill. Shikata teaches deburring at angles between 5 and 90 degrees using a ball end mill, for the purpose of deburring surfaces that are curved. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the automotive knuckle of AAPA with the deburring using the angle and ball end mill of Shikata in order to deburr the open end portion of the through hole through the fitting hole.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Di Ponio and Fierro disclose automotive knuckles with a wheel speed sensor. Fried, Oldham, and Gaiser disclose deburring methods.

Art Unit: 3722

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric A. Gates whose telephone number is 571-272-5498. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:00-4:30 & alt Fridays 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Eric A. Gates
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3722

las

EAG 19 August 2005

> BOYER D. ASHLEY PRIMARY EXAMINER